

## REMARKS

Claims 1-23 and 25-26 are pending and stand rejected. None of the claims has been amended.

Claims 1-23 and 25-26 stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17, 37-53, and 54-64 of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,985. A terminal disclaimer is hereby enclosed to obviate this rejection.

Claims 1-23 and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Loader. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner, the Examiner's supervisor, and the undersigned attorney held a telephone interview on August 16, 2006, during which they discussed claim 1 and Loader. The substance of the interview is set forth below.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method in a computer operating system for associating an identifier with a plurality of processes, the method comprising:  
starting a first process;  
associating the first process with the identifier;  
creating, from the first process, a second process;  
associating the second process with the identifier;  
associating a third process with the identifier, wherein the third process is  
not a descendant of the first process;  
creating, from the third process, a fourth process; and  
associating the fourth process with the identifier.

Claim 1 is directed to a method in a computer operating system for associating an identifier with a plurality of processes. Note that the identifier is associated with the first process, the second process, the third process, and the fourth process.

Loader discusses processing interrupt requests in an operating system having different types of supervisor programs concerned with specified types of interrupt events (abstract). In the

Detailed Action, the Examiner argues that:

- Loader's supervisor program installation routine (3:17-18) corresponds to the claimed element "a first process";
- Loader's interrupt execution service routine (4:37) corresponds to the claimed element "a second process";
- Loader's substitute IH installation routine (3:30) corresponds to the claimed element "a third process";
- Loader's environment modeller routine (3:60) corresponds to the claimed element "a fourth process"; and
- Loader's supervisor program status information (3:19-29) corresponds to the claimed element "the identifier".

Assume, *arguendo*, that the Examiner is correct. Claim 1 recites associating the identifier with the second process, the third process, and the fourth process. However, Loader does not disclose associating the supervisor program status information (identifier) with any of the interrupt execution service routine (second process), the substitute IH installation routine (third process), or the environment modeller routine (fourth process). Thus, Loader does not disclose, teach, or suggest any of the following claimed limitations: "associating the second process with the identifier"; "associating a third process with the identifier"; and "associating the fourth process with the identifier."

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Loader. Independent claims 11, 18, 23, and 25-26 recite similar language and are also patentable over Loader for at least the same reasons.

The grounds for rejection set forth by the Examiner in the fourth section of the Detailed

Action (pages 5-6) supposedly address claims 1-23 and 25-26. However, the grounds for rejection are directed at only the limitations of claim 1. There is no specific discussion of any of the features of the other rejected claims. MPEP § 707.07 states: "A plurality of claims should never be grouped together in a common rejection, unless that rejection is equally applicable to all claims in the group." Due to the many distinct features of these claims, the omnibus rejection is improper. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 2-23 and 25-26.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
PAWAN GOYAL, ET AL.

Dated: August 18, 2006

By: /Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale/  
Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale  
Reg. No. 55,687  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7187  
Fax.: (650) 938-5200